

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>IN RE: CENTURYLINK SALES<br/>PRACTICES AND SECURITIES<br/>LITIGATION</b></p> <p>This Document Relates to:</p> <p>Civil Action No. 18-296 (MJD/KMM)<br/>Civil Action No. 18-297 (MJD/KMM)<br/>Civil Action No. 18-298 (MJD/KMM)<br/>Civil Action No. 18-299 (MJD/KMM)</p> | <p><b>MDL No. 17-2795 (MJD/KMM)</b></p> <p><b>[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING<br/>LEAD PLAINTIFF OREGON’S<br/>MOTION FOR CONSOLIDATION<br/>OF RELATED ACTION</b></p> |
|--|--|

Upon consideration of the Motion filed by Lead Plaintiff the State of Oregon by and through the Oregon State Treasurer and the Oregon Public Employee Retirement Board, on behalf of the Oregon Public Employee Retirement Fund (“Oregon”) for consolidation of related action; (2) the Memorandum of Law in support thereof; and (3) all other pleadings and arguments submitted to this Court; and for good cause shown,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

1. Oregon’s Motion is **GRANTED**.
2. Pursuant to Rule 42(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, *Inter-Marketing Group USA, Inc. v. CenturyLink, Inc.*, No. 0:18-cv-0299-MJD-KMM (D. Minn.) (“*IMG*”), and any subsequently filed, removed, or transferred actions that assert claims under the federal securities laws and are related to the claims asserted in the above-

captioned actions, are **CONSOLIDATED** with the *CenturyLink* securities class action for all purposes.<sup>1</sup>

3. Inter-Marketing Group USA, Inc.’s Motion for Appointment as Lead Plaintiff and Approval of Lead Counsel in *IMG* (*IMG*, ECF No. 36) is **DENIED** as moot.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_, 2018

---

HON. MICHAEL J. DAVIS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> The “*CenturyLink* securities class action” includes the securities class actions previously consolidated by Magistrate Judge Perez-Montes of the Western District of Louisiana: *Craig v. CenturyLink, Inc.*, No. 0:18-cv-0296-MJD-KMM (D. Minn.); *Thummeti v. CenturyLink, Inc.*, No. 0:18-cv-0298-MJD-KMM (D. Minn.); and *Scott v. CenturyLink, Inc.*, No. 0:18-cv-0297-MJD-KMM (D. Minn.). See *Craig v. CenturyLink, Inc.*, 2017 WL 4785647 (W.D. La. Oct. 19, 2017).